



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

advanced on this point than I have touched upon, but a review is not the proper place for a full discussion.

E. SAPIR.

RENWARD BRANDSTETTER. — Die Reduplikation in den indianischen, indonesischen und indogermanischen Sprachen (Beilage zum Jahresbericht der Luzerner Kantonschule): 1917.

In this treatise the author gives a survey of those phenomena of reduplication which are found in each of the three groups of languages mentioned in the title. Types found in only one or two of these groups, however interesting they may be, are left out of consideration. Each type mentioned is represented by one example drawn from each of the three groups. When the author assures us that his examples are taken from the best texts we are, of course, quite willing to believe him; but still we should have been much obliged to him if he had taken the trouble to mention his sources in each separate case. Especially regarding the origin of his Indian examples some more information would not have been superfluous, since even an americanist can hardly be supposed to recognise these sources by intuition. The paper is purely descriptive throughout: it is an enumeration of parallels, and even the relations between forms and functions have hardly been taken notice of. So the reader who expects to learn something about the essential character of this interesting phenomenon will be sorely disappointed: what he does learn is that, even after Brandstetter's list of parallels from a great number of linguistic stocks published in 1917, Pott's well-known book on reduplication, printed in 1862, remains our best starting-point for further inquiry. Evidently Brandstetter himself is not aware of this fact; at least he never shows that he is, though it is hardly to

be supposed that the imposing array of data presented by that eminent scholar has not materially facilitated his own investigations.

As Brandstetter's study practically contains neither new facts nor new ideas, the task of his reviewer is not a grateful one.

It might have been otherwise if the author had made an effort to penetrate a little deeper into his subject. That he has not done so is the more astonishing because some valuable preparatory work has already been done. Already Pott had perceived that the numerous and very divergent functions of reduplication (in its widest sense) may, all of them, be traced back to the same psychic motive. He speaks of "quantitative steigerung", which, however, may lead to a qualitative change of meaning (Pott, *Die Reduplikation*, p. 22). About 45 years later the same idea was much more technically expressed by van Ginneken when he demonstrated that all reduplication is a manifestation of psychic energy (Jac. van Ginneken, *Principes de linguistique psychologique*, see Index s. v. redoublements). Pott distinguished further between intensive and extensive "steigerung": the former manifesting itself e. g. in reduplicated interjections, "lallwörter", onomatopoeia; the latter in reduplicated plurals and distributive numerals. Thus far these two groups of Pott correspond to van Ginneken's general classification, which distinguishes between extrinsic and intrinsic energy; but Pott's conception of the essential character of each group is rather superficial. As to this point van Ginneken's argument opens a new aspect. According to him the difference between e. g. "lallwörter" and plurals consists in this that the psychic energy manifesting itself in the reduplication in the former case originates from the emotional attitude of the speaker and in the latter case is stimulated by the meaning of the grammatical form itself. In his opinion the types of reduplication belonging to group I

(extrinsic energy) represent a period in the development of language when people *used to speak with more sentiment* or to articulate less clearly. He might have added that both factors may easily be observed in modern child language, though I am far from asserting that this *proves* anything. In group I are also classed the reduplicated forms of numerous very old roots which could not possibly be classified according to their meaning, but which generally belong to the most indispensable part of the vocabulary. As usually, van Ginneken, after stimulating our interest to the utmost, leaves the subject; attempting to construct a well thought out theory out of his sporadic remarks is quite as useless as trying to read by an occasional flash of lightning. In the first place his explanation of reduplications resulting from extrinsic energy is rather vague. That uncivilized peoples speak with more sentiment than we do, is not to be denied, but about the statement that they articulate less clearly we should be glad to hear something more. Further, does van Ginneken mean that there has been a period in the development of language when all words occurred in a reduplicated form only? This must be our inference if it is true that the meaning of the words themselves had nothing whatever to do with the circumstance that they were reduplicated. But in this case it is obviously impossible to distinguish between the two groups, as *any* reduplicated form may have originated in the period when reduplication was universal. It is evident that van Ginneken's theory cannot quite satisfy us, but this does not imply that his classification is wholly wrong. It will be admitted, I think, that at least one of his groups is really suggestive of a definite semantic category. This category comprises those cases of reduplication whose functions may be summarized by the general term *increase*: plural forms, distributives, intensity of action, continuity of action, repetition

of action, customary action, superlatives etc. (for American examples see the Handbook of American Indian Languages I). With a view to the mental attitude of the speaker we may perhaps call them *emphatic* reduplications. If we now consider the numerous reduplications which are not immediately recognizable as belonging to the emphatic group, we meet with a striking variety: thus we find a. o. onomatopoeia, "lallwörter", adjectives of color, shape and surface quality, nomina actoris and acti; further reduplication may express unreality, imitation, playful activity. Among these various functions the last mentioned group seems to present itself as a semantic category indicating the idea of *unreality*. According to van Ginneken, this group has about the same function as the Indo-European *vrddhi*-derivatives, which he calls "allongements d'hésitation" in contradistinction to the "allongements d'emphase", which seem to be (psychologically) akin to our emphatic reduplications. Further the onomatopoeia and "lallwörter", whose common characteristic seems to consist in their *emotional* nature, cannot well be separated from the foregoing group, though here the emotional element is less obvious. No doubt van Ginneken's first class, with which the "lallwörter" group brings us into touch again, is large enough to embrace both of them. However, there is no reason to regard these reduplications as "survivals" belonging to a period when reduplication was well-nigh universal because people used to speak with more sentiment: even to our "civilized" conceptions the character of the concerned words is quite sufficient to explain the sentiment with which they were pronounced. The only kind of reduplications which undoubtedly originate of extrinsic energy are those found among the interjections; but these belong to all times and all peoples.

It is quite true that there remain a great

number of reduplications, especially in Indo-European, whose functions we cannot even guess, but the very fact that these roots belong to the most primitive part of the vocabulary (as van Ginneken argues) would seem to suggest the possibility that we are here confronted with an ethno-psychological problem which the present state of our knowledge does not enable us to solve. Some types may be less mysterious than they would seem to be at first sight. If e. g. the adjectives of color, shape, and surface quality are really to be regarded as iteratives (red here and there), as Gatschet thought (*Contributions to North American Ethnology* II, part 1, p. 276), they belong to our emphatic group; and this author's valuable information about distributive nomina actoris and acti in Klamath whose distributive meaning ("action done at different times or occasions repeatedly, habitually or gradually"; Gatschet, *ibidem*) suggests the idea that perhaps all reduplicated nomina actoris, agentis, and acti may originally have had this meaning.

These few remarks about some of the most common types of reduplication may suffice to show that a careful inquiry into the psychological background of the phenomenon considered in its entirety may be expected to yield important results. However, such an inquiry should be founded on a somewhat complete set of data and not on a number of facts arbitrarily selected. A very valuable foundation would e. g. be afforded by a survey of all the types reduplication of found in languages of North America, whereas a comparative treatment embracing such an enormous field as the one represented by Brandstetter's short paper cannot be but both incomplete and superficial.

Finally I may be allowed to remind the reader of the existence of a highly important morphological problem connected with our subject, viz. the relation between reduplica-

tion and vocalic intermutation ("change") in North American languages. Several years ago Uhlenbeck pointed out the probability that, wherever it presents itself, this vocalic intermutation has originated of reduplication attended with vocalic differentiation (C. C. Uhlenbeck, *Grammatical distinctions in Algonquian* demonstrated especially from the Ojibway-dialect, Leyden, E. J. Brill, 1909, pp. 10-20). Though the available evidence is perhaps not yet conclusive it is not to be disputed that more recent data point in the same direction. So Boas is inclined to think that certain plural forms in the Nass river dialect which show modifications of length and accent of stem syllables have originated by secondary modification of reduplicated forms (*Handbook Amer. Ind. Lang.* I 373). The same may be said of modification of the vowel replacing distributive reduplication in Kwakiutl (Boas, *ibid.*, 519, 522). An interesting example of how this process may take place is to be found in Sapir's paper on noun reduplication in Comox (Canada Geological Survey, *Memoir* 63: type IV on p. 16), in which language we also meet with nouns reduplicated to begin with and substituting for plural reduplication a change of the first stem vowel (*ibid.*, p. 18). If it could be proved that Uhlenbeck's suggestion is true, this would be a discovery of the greatest importance, not only with regard to the North American languages under consideration, but also with a view to the problem of the qualitative "ablaut" in Indo-European, although the psychological relation between the latter and the North American "change" is still obscure.

It is to be hoped that Brandstetter's descriptive essay is to be regarded as the precursor of a thorough inquiry in which full justice will be done to every side of the problem.

J. P. B. DE JOSSELIN DE JONG.

State Museum of Ethnography, Leiden.